

THE CHINESE RECORDER AND MISSIONARY JOURNAL.

VOL. 1.

FOOCHOW, MARCH, 1869.

No. 11.

THE RELATION OF CHRISTIANS TO THE EXAMINATIONS.

Read before the Foochow Missionary Conference, January 26th, 1869.

BY REV. C. HARTWELL.

"Should Chinese Christians be encouraged to compete for degrees at the literary and military examinations? How should the question of the observance of the Sabbath be treated in this connection?"

The subject presented for discussion today is a very practical and important one. One of the questions which most naturally occur to the mind of a literary man in China, when considering the claims of Christianity upon his personal acceptance, is, in case I become a Christian can I attend at the examinations for literary degrees? And a similar question must arise in the case of those desiring to compete for the military degrees, if he would follow Christ. Every missionary in China, too, may naturally expect to be called upon by literary and military candidates, or their friends, for advice or instruction upon this subject; and therefore it is one in regard to which he should be well informed, and ready to give an intelligent and correct opinion. Ill-founded objections to attendance at the examinations may prove a stumbling-block in the way of some honest seekers after the truth; while, on the other hand, misjudged approval of such a course may lead to serious evils.

In order to discussfully the question whether "Chinese Christians should be encouraged to compete for degrees at the literary and military examinations," it would be necessary, manifestly, to consider the design of these competitive trials, the manner in which they are held, what is required of the successful competitors, and what is the influence of this system of conferring degrees upon the welfare of the community generally. But as time on the present occasion will not allow of discussing all these points in detail, and as most present are sufficiently informed in regard to them to render a lengthy discussion of them unnecessary, I shall confine myself, in this essay, to a consideration of those principles and facts connected with the sub-

ject which present real or apparent difficulties, and seem to render conformity to the prescribed rules by Christians as of doubtful propriety.

The main design of these competitive examinations in China is to secure men of distinguished ability for employment in the different branches of the government service. Civil officers of government have been selected in this manner from the time of Tai-tsung of the Tang dynasty, who reigned in the seventh century. The military examinations are of more recent date. The general plan of entering civil office through the system of literary degrees is for the graduates of the first degree to advance through the second to the third degree. The graduates of the third degree then enter the examination held in the palace, when their names are arranged upon several lists according to their standing, they at once receiving official rank, and becoming entitled to enter certain offices as soon as there are vacancies for them to fill. The lowest rank to which any of the graduates of the third degree are assigned is the seventh, and the lowest office which they are called to fill is that of district magistrate. But as the successful competitors for the third degree are few compared with the whole number of those who have secured the second one, there are ways open to the graduates of this degree also to enter directly into office without securing the third degree. And the same is the case again in regard to the graduates of the first degree; some of them can become officials without obtaining either of the higher degrees. In regard to the military graduates, all who obtain the second degree, and are unsuccessful in the trial for the higher one, are expected to enter the service at once with the rank of lieutenant, they having the choice of entering whichever company they may please to select.

Now if honesty requires that those who compete for the literary and military degrees should accept of the theory upon which the system of the competitive trials is founded, and should design to enter the government service as soon as the way is opened to them, the question at once arises, should Chinese Christians be encouraged to seek for office under a heathen government, whose rules at

present require the occupants of the various offices to do things which are contrary to the plain teachings of Christianity? It would seem that there could be but one answer to this question in the minds of enlightened men. As long as the Chinese government remains what it now is, manifestly, no Chinese Christian—to give a particular example—could fill the office of district magistrate under it. According to the testimony of Mahomedans themselves, those of their number who fill this and other offices are required to offer incense to idols, and do do this, contrary to the principles of their religion. But it may be said that not all who obtain literary and military degrees are required to become government officials. The conferring of these degrees, too, has a secondary object of promoting education among the people. These degrees, also, give those who have acquired them general influence in the community, and it is desirable to have good men in posts of honor and influence; All these statements are true; and we may hope that the time will come, perhaps soon, when this government will be so changed that good men not only can hold unofficial posts of honor in the community, but also posts of official honor under the government. Literary and military graduates at present are not by virtue of their degrees servants of the government, though it would seem that the primary intention was that they should become such. And as the present tendency is to diminish the little aid which they receive from the government in obtaining their degrees, the claim which government has upon their services is becoming less and less. Perhaps even now there need be no scruple as to whether it is an honest course to seek for the degrees in order to secure honor and influence in the community, while one is unwilling to proceed in the regular order, step by step, and become an official. The Chinese themselves do not see any dishonesty in doing this; and as the practice of it has become quite general, perhaps we may decide that there is no objection on this ground against Christians competing for the degrees.

Another point requiring particular examination is in regard to the character of the ceremonies prescribed for the candidates and graduates. And on this point, for the sake of brevity, I shall confine myself to those connected with obtaining the first degree. In the examinations themselves for obtaining the first literary degree, there appear to be no ceremonies that seemingly conflict with the principles of Christianity. In the trials for the first military degree there appear, also, to be none, unless objection be made to the numerous kotows which the candidates all have to make, and for which

they are said to be ridiculed sometimes by their more favored brethren of the literary class.

The ceremonies which the successful competitors for the first literary degree are expected to perform are, first, on the evening after their success is announced, for them to make their kotows before the persons who recommended them as candidates, and then on the next day to do the same before their former teachers. Sometimes in cases where teachers have died, they place their tablets in chairs, and kneel before them. These ceremonies, however, though said to be customary, are not, so far as I am informed, officially prescribed, and probably Christians need not at least bow before the tablets of any deceased teachers. But the ceremonies on the day appointed for investing the graduates with the golden-flowered pin and scarf, are ordered officially; and their character is seen from the following translations of the official notifications posted at the Provincial Chancellor's office in this city one week ago to-day. The first states: "The Provincial Chancellor hereby notifies the recent literary and military graduates of the Manchus and others belonging to the Foo-chow Prefecture, that on the 7th instant, between seven and nine in the morning, they will go to the Prefect's office to be invested with the flowered pin and scarf. Then they will at once assemble at the Confucian temple, where the several under chancellors will conduct them to kneel before the sages. When this is over, they will come to my office for reception, and will then proceed to call upon the Viceroy, the Governor, the Major General and the other officials. A special notification." The ceremonies at this official reception are described in a second notification as follows:

"The Provincial Chancellor hereby informs the recent graduates that, according to the ritual for official receptions, they should bow and kneel four times, according to the usual mode of pupils paying their respects to their teachers. In the present instance, however, arranging themselves ten in a row, they will first bow, then make a kotow, then bow again and make a second kotow, when they will be excused from the two other kotows, and on rising will simply advance and bow a third time. When this is through, they will arrange themselves in two rows, and bow to each other. Let there be no want of concert in the ceremonies. A special notification."

Perhaps there need be no scruple in regard to the prostrations required before officials and teachers, as they are understood to be simply forms of ceremony; but it is evident from one of the above notices that kneeling

towards the tablet of Confucius is a rule officially prescribed for all the graduates. I visited the Confucian temple on the day referred to, and saw the candles and incense burning before his tablet, and the arrangements for the graduates to kneel, just inside the outer door. I am told however that notwithstanding the order in the official notification, the graduates are not now conducted by the under chancellors to worship Confucius, but are left to themselves to kneel one or two at a time, as it is convenient for them to visit the temple, and that in some cases the visit is omitted perhaps altogether. Probably a Christian could avoid this worshipping of Confucius, should he obtain a degree. Should this prove to be the case, and should the view be taken that there is no necessary harm in kneeling before the officers, there seems to be nothing in the ceremonies required that would prevent a Christian from competing for the degree.

A third point demanding particular consideration is, whether the examinations can be attended, and the Sabbath properly observed. Here at Foochow we have to do simply with those for conferring the first and second degrees.

In regard to the preliminary examinations for the first literary degree, held by the inferior officers previous to the grand trial before the Provincial Chancellor, there is generally no call for violation of the Sabbath, as there are always supplementary examinations which one can attend when a primary one is held on that day. But when the trial before the Chancellor occurs on the Lord's day, there is no resource left but to stay away, and wait until an opportunity occurs another year, hoping that it will not come upon the Sabbath. The Christian certainly should hold his desire for a degree in subjection to the command to "remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." The seeking for a degree is wholly voluntary on his part, and no satisfactory excuse can be given for not obeying his Lord in observing the Sabbath. But should the grand trial not occur upon the Sabbath, and should the Christian be successful in competing for his degree, could he enter the review of the successful competitors always held soon after, should that be appointed on the Sabbath? This he manifestly should not do. His duty requires in this case that he should forfeit his degree by his absence, and still wait for another opportunity.

In the examinations for the first military degree, the difficulties in avoiding violations of the Sabbath are more numerous than in those for the first literary degree. There are several different trials of skill held on three different days by each examining of-

ficer, and it would be very extraordinary should none of the appointments occur on the Sabbath. Should this be the case, there would be no honest course for a Christian to pursue but to remain away, and give up seeking the degree for the time.

Should the day appointed for receiving the flowered-pin and scarf happen upon the Sabbath, perhaps the Christian could absent himself from the official receptions without forfeiting his degree. The roll is called at the Prefect's office, but all are not usually present to answer in order to their names. At the Chancellor's reception, too, it is not probable that the failure of one or two to appear would be noticed when there are hundreds to be received. Still this would be contrary to rule, and would have a discreditable appearance. May we not earnestly hope, however, that the time will come when Christians can be excused for non-attendance on Christian grounds? In the usual reviews, and other examinations of the graduates of the first literary degree, and in those which are preliminary to the trials for the second degree, there are supplementary examinations, and therefore a Christian probably could attend all that are necessary without violating the Sabbath. But a serious difficulty is found in passing through the grand examinations for the second degree, which occupy nine days. The second thousand candidates enter the hall on the first day, write essays on the second, and leave the hall on the third. The same order is pursued on the fourth, fifth and sixth, and the seventh, eighth and ninth days, so that every day is appointed for entering or leaving the hall or for writing. One Sabbath at least must occur during this time, and there may be two Sabbaths. Now, should Christians be encouraged to enter the examinations, or leave them, or write essays upon the Sabbath? I fail to see how there can be any doubt in regard to the impropriety of their doing this. Either seems to be a plain violation of the Sabbath, and therefore intelligent Christians would conscientiously abstain from doing it. It has been suggested that, in case the day for writing should be the Sabbath, the Christian could wait till after midnight, and then do his writing during Monday morning and Monday forenoon; and possibly this could be done if he were a very ready writer. Perhaps, also, when the day for leaving the hall should be the Sabbath, he could wait till after midnight before leaving. Possibly there may be ways, therefore, for a Christian to pass through the nine days without formally breaking the fourth commandment; though it would seem very difficult for him to observe the spirit of the command.

The difficulties in the way of observing the Sabbath in competing for the second military degree need not be specified. They are, however, quite as numerous as in competing for the first military degree; and it would seem nearly or quite impossible for a person to give the required attendance, and not violate sacred time.

There are no other points of difficulty in regard to this subject of which I am aware. In arguing the negative side of the question, however, one might well dwell on the amount of time and money requisite to secure the degrees under consideration. It would be difficult to show that the usual expenditure of time and money is a wise use of them. But I shall not dwell upon this, as I do not purpose to exhaust the subject. As the essay is preliminary to the general discussion of the question, I have aimed simply to indicate the points essential in the consideration of it. I have endeavored also to avoid unnecessarily expressing my own opinions upon the points at issue, desiring to do so only so far as this appeared necessary in giving a brief and, at the same time, clear statement of the subject. I now leave the subject for others to discuss, and decide in regard to it, every one for himself. Perhaps it may be allowable however, in closing, for me to state my own conclusions in regard to it. At the present time, and under the present rules, it does not seem to me that Chinese Christians should be encouraged to compete for the literary and military degrees; and, in the main, for the following reasons :

1. It is doubtful whether they can succeed, and avoid violating the Sabbath in doing it.

2. The prescribed ceremonies are such that it is doubtful whether a Christian can act honorably in the eyes of the world, and not violate his conscience. He is to avoid the appearance of evil.

3. It involves a doubtful expenditure of much time and money.

4. The advantages to be gained are of such a nature, and the temptations to pride and worldliness which they bring with them are so great, that they can hardly be called certain benefits.

I would not however take the ground that a Christian Chinese could not consistently attend at some of the examinations. His views might be correct in the main, and he honestly think that he was striving to honor Christ.

"STATISTICS OF ROMISH MISSIONS, AND THEIR LESSONS."

An article with the above title, which appeared in your number for August last, has been read with much interest, and has created quite a sensation. We understand that some Protestants hold themselves in readiness to defend it from all attacks that may be made upon it; while a Roman Bishop, or Mission Superintendent, on reading it expressed much pleasure with the evidence it afforded that the heretics would soon all be back in the bosom of "mother church." For ourselves, when we first read it, we felt that it was worthy of attention; and we believe that we have done that which before its publication there was perhaps danger of our leaving undone—i. e., have made it a matter of "conscientious study" up to the present time. Even the table of statistics has not been found to be either dry or uninteresting, but we have found it to present new food for thought almost every time that we have turned to it; while we have felt that the "lessons" were presented in very readable, racy, well written English. Perhaps the most striking feature presented in the paper is the magnitude of the results shown by the number of Christians, compared with the scantiness of outlay manifested in the column headed "expenses." We cordially agree with "Protestant" that the statistics "speak for themselves." The important question is, Do they speak the truth? My answer to this question, and my reasons for it, I hope to make plain in what follows. Does "Protestant" know whether the amounts in the statistics represent the actual expenditures of the missions, or only what they cost the society over and above that portion which is wiped off by the revenues of each establishment? There are perhaps few who will question the accuracy of "A Layman's" remarks in your November number, to the effect that the Roman Catholic missions are to a great extent self supporting, that they trade a trifle, are land owners, are deeply interested in China financially as well as religiously.

Again, it is well known that there are nuns or sisters connected with the Romish missions in China. Their support is not mentioned in the statistics. They cannot, as is sometimes the case in Protestant societies, be included in the number of clergymen. If it can be ascertained that their support, though not mentioned, is included in the statistics, this fact will make "Protestant's" arguments still stronger; but if it is not included, this will add another very strong suspicion to that expressed by "A Layman" that there

are other funds used by Romish missionaries besides those presented in the statistics. And if we get the ghost of a doubt once fairly raised, it is hard to say what havoc it will make before we get it laid. Who knows but it will turn into the Trojan horse that will leave the most stately and carefully prepared columns of statistics, as far as reliable testimony is concerned, a heap of ruins and confusion?

Again, it is said that great attention is given to schools at every mission station. Now, are the expenses of those schools presented in the statistics? I do not believe they are; because at Ningpo there is a foundling hospital, and schools also, containing if we mistake not several hundreds of children. The cost of maintaining a number of children in China can be estimated, very nearly, without admission into the *arcana* of Romanism; and I think I hazard nothing at all in saying that the Roman Catholic schools alone at Ningpo require a greater annual expenditure of money than that given in the statistics for the work in the entire province of Chekiang. Can "Protestant" enlighten us on this subject? Are the schools and foundling hospital at Ningpo accounted for in the \$3,600 stated as the annual expenditure in the province of Chekiang? It will be noticed that no money is required by the statistics for educational purposes in this province. And this introduces another very grave suspicion of the accuracy and reliability of the statistics. We are told that great attention is given to schools, but no schools are provided for in the statistics, unless it be in the column headed "divinity students." The Roman Catholics surely cannot regard every little ragamuffin in their day or boarding schools a student of divinity; or if they do, the expression "Great attention is given to schools" is sadly out of place, when they can account for only 331 students in the whole of China. Why, the scholars connected with Protestant schools in Ningpo alone amount to nearly the third of that sum. Would it not be true to say "Great attention is given to schools;" these schools have had their share in bringing about the "Grand Result;" but they are costly, and are not accounted for in the "expenses," which fact makes the table of expenses simply good for nothing as a matter of testimony?

There is still another point. In addition to the six reasons given for the success of Popery, another might have been adduced—viz., the imposing appearance of the buildings connected with their charitable, religious and educational institutions. No one can deny that this has an effect; and this effect has never been used to better advantage than by the Romish Church. We read in a re-

cent newspaper that there is at present a Roman Catholic cathedral in course of construction at Canton that will cost about three millions of dollars, and that a similar one is being erected at Peking; while in nearly every important city of the Empire they are building a church. Now, the sums required for the erection and care of such buildings are expended, wisely or foolishly, in propagating the Romanist's religion. Are they included in the table of expenses? We feel here like using the strong, excited language of some of the old Hebrews, and saying, "Hear, O heaven; and give ear, O earth! hath such a thing been in your days?" The emissaries of Rome, who have drawn more deeply on the credulity of mankind than perhaps any other class of men beneath the sun, publish to the world that they are carrying on mission operations throughout the whole of this vast Empire, and that their entire annual expenditure of money does very little more than amount to the sixtieth part of what they are at present spending on only two of many buildings to be used in carrying on these mission operations; and an intelligent, educated Protestant not only sends abroad the publication with words of commendation; but after two or three months of reflection on the subject comes forth again, and tells us that it is "no doubt reliable!"

We will of course be told that the native Christians contribute money. This we fully believe. But take all the 363,580 Christians in China; subtract from that sum the children in schools and the probable proportion of other non-producers, and it will be found that the remnant that are left are entirely inadequate to make up the deficiency in dollars and cents.

The column giving the number of Christians, like that giving the expenses, speaks for itself; not however to produce the impression that it is prepared with accuracy, or with scrupulous regard to veracity. The first thing that strikes our attention in this column is its manifest tendency to step to the tune of a thousand. It contains, with the foot note, twenty-two entries; the smallest number of Christians given is 2,000—the largest 335,167; and of the twenty numbers between these two, only two contain the fraction of a thousand, so that one is strongly inclined to suspect that a thousand is the unit employed in making up the number of Christians connected with the Romish missions. Of twenty-two sums, to each of which accretions must be made individually, does it not seem very strange that nineteen should come out just the round thousand at the time of closing the reports for the year? Did it not suggest itself to

"Protestant," when he was transcribing the tables, that there must be lumping somewhere in them? Now if lumping occurs in the tables, as few who read them will doubt, we may be permitted to ask, is there any clew to its extent? On which side of the comma that divides between the hundreds and the thousands does it occur? Where did it begin? Did it begin and end with the compiler of the statistics, or did it begin lower down in the ranks of the clergy? Evidence is not altogether wanting that it begins among the inferior clergy. Take the number of Christians in Szechuen; the entry in the column is 68,000; but in a foot note attention is called to the fact that it is at present 90,000—i. e., at the end of, or sometime in, 1866, there were 68,000 Papists in Szechuen, but sometime in 1868, when "Protestant" prepared his "lessons," they had come round again to the even 90,000. One cannot but feel that it is a pity there were not 4,000 more; for that would just be the round thousand to each priest in the province. But does "Protestant" regard these statistics as of strict veracity? We do not. We would just as soon think of giving credence to the wildest romance contained in any work of fiction, founded on fact.

There is another circumstance that seems to my mind to militate against the truth of the column giving the number of Christians—viz., the almost incredibly large congregations that they require. Take the sum of all the priests and bishops, natives and foreign, in the East; and divide this number into the number of Christians, and you will find that each clergyman has charge of somewhat over a thousand Christians. Or make the same investigation in China, and you will find that each clergyman has on an average a little over seven hundred souls under his care. We have by us the statistics of two Protestant churches in America, and dividing the number of church members by the number of pastors we find in the one case a little over 120, and in the other a little over 130 members to each congregation. Of course some of these churches are in very sparsely settled regions. But the vassals of Rome in China must be very docile, if they receive much benefit from their pastors. This will be still more evident, when we remember that, notwithstanding the difficulties of locomotion here, the priest has probably sometimes to travel several hundreds of miles before he can visit all his flock. Mencius tells us of a man of Ts'e who came home occasionally in a state of intoxication; his wife and concubine, on asking what company he kept, were told that he had been associating with the rich and great; but none of this class ever visiting at his home, the ladies became suspicious,

and resolved to watch where he went, and find out for themselves. We have tried to put into practice the principles of the women of Ts'e, and have made, or caused to be made, inquiries for these large congregations of Papists; but have hitherto entirely failed in finding them. In some places we have been told of several tens, in other places of more or less than ten; and though we are aware of a number of Romish chapels, we do not know of one where they report several hundreds attending the Sabbath services. Has any Protestant traveller, merchant or missionary, stumbled on these large congregations? We will believe in them when we have creditable evidence of their existence.

If missionaries of other churches report a certain number of Christians in a city or village, any visitor, on passing through the place, can, if he takes the trouble, find his way to the chapel on the Lord's day; and if at the proper hour, he will find a large proportion of the reported Christians at worship in the chapel. Protestant converts who cease to attend worship cease to be reported as Christians. And with all our care, it is found that there are sometimes "baptized heathen" who have been reported as Christians. But does this fact, with "Protestant's" help, not satisfactorily explain the discrepancy between the reported number of Christians, and the ascertained number who attend worship in the chapels connected with the Romish missions? "Protestant" says, with them "Baptism is the beginning of doctrine;" "Rome receives into the church, then instructs;" "The line of demarcation is less wide between them and the world around them," &c., &c. Now if we held and practised these principles, we might with far more propriety than at present make the round thousand the unit in reporting the results of our labor; though it is very doubtful whether the real success would be much greater than at present.

But we have remained so long contemplating the structure of these stately columns as scarcely to leave ourselves time to notice some things that seem worthy of attention in the "lessons."

It seems to us that "Protestant's" rhetoric appears to better advantage in his "lessons" than his logic; his statements, if admitted, will owe more to sophism than to syllogism—e. g., he says, "It would be unfair to measure the Romish church at the present day especially in England, France and America, by its own apparent standard in the middle ages." Very true! Never was a truer word spoken! If England be unjust in her government, the United States are not the place to visit to experience that injustice; if Spain is tyrannical, the Netherlands are not the

place to go to if we want to find out that tyranny. The reason is that the Netherlands have thrown off the Spanish yoke, and the United States have ceased to be British colonies. For a similar reason, England or America is not the place to visit to discover the genius of the Romish Church. Protestantism has been by law the established religion in England for several centuries. No thanks to Popery, if it is not there now what it was once. In America, the state profess-
edly countenances no one form of the Christian religion above any other; and in France, it is not long since all forms of the Christian religion were alike overthrown. Tell us not what Popery is in countries where it cannot employ the power of the state to accomplish its selfish ends; or where it is modified and restrained by Protestantism, or by bold infidelity, if you will; but where it has the power it possessed during the middle ages, tell us how much it is different now from then. We must go elsewhere, as "Protestant" doubtless very well knows, than to either of the above named countries to discover the present standard of Popery. "If you would know a man, visit him at home." Why did "Protestant" not send us at once to Rome, the very heart and throne of Popery, where the Papacy has full sweep, rather than to some far off country where Rome's religion exists only by sufferance, or on a common level with every other religion, if he wanted to exhibit her in her native beauty? Take the recent closing of all Protestant places of worship in Rome, and the Pope's letter on religious toleration in Austria, and tell us what different spirit they manifest from that manifested by Popery during the middle ages. Wherein are Roman Catholic publications, whether from Pope, priest or bishop, different in tone now from what they were four centuries ago? If you would know the present standard of Popery, read the Pope's bulls. Has he disapproved of St. Bartholemew? or regretted, except their failure, Alva's efforts to tread under foot the religious liberties of the Netherlands? or said that Charles V. was mistaken when he gave his parting charge to his son and successor to "cherish the holy inquisition"—which meant to burn, behead, or bury alive people for reading the Bible? A recent attempt by an official, from a country where Popery is in the ascendant, to suppress the circulation of the "Pilgrim's Progress" in China, because it truly teaches that although the Pope has not the power, he has lost none of his former spirit, to suppress religious freedom, is of the same kind with, though on a very different scale from, the efforts of Philip to suppress the Reformation.

There is another idea presented in the sentence now under review, of which we scarcely know what to make. "Protestant" speaks of the *apparent* standard of the Romish church in the middle ages. "Apparent" has sometimes the meaning of *seeming*, in distinction from *true* or *real*. It seems to us that that is the idea intended to be conveyed by it here. We read that Pope Sixtus patronized debauchery, as well as murder; that he established stews and brothels, in which he was a regular and steady customer, and from which his sacred treasury received an annual augmentation of 20,000 ducats. We have read also of Tetzel's sale of indulgences in Germany. And in those days the great body of the Romish clergy corresponded in character with the above mentioned brace of heroes. Yet we hear men talking now of the *apparent* standard of the Romish church in the middle ages. It had an apparent standard, but that was its real one. As Hamlet says:

"Seems, madam! nay, it is; I know not seems."

We confidently believe that Rome's apparent and real standard in the middle ages was immeasurably more corrupt than it is at present; the good effects of the Protestant reformation are by no means felt only in the Protestant communion. One is of course obliged to write in a desultory manner, if he would notice all the points made by "Protestant" in favor of Popery. "Protestant" seems to think that because Romanists hold the doctrine of the Trinity, the charge of corruption, if made against them, must be made under a very modified form. "It contains the doctrine of one God." So it does; and it teaches too that the wafer over which the priest or pope has pronounced the words of consecration is just as worthy of adoration as that one God, the creator of the world. "The ever adorable Redeemer." Just so; but does it not in effect teach that the clergy are just as competent to forgive sins as that Redeemer; and that his intercession is nothing without that of his virgin mother? "The Holy Ghost, the author of the Scriptures." Grant this again; but has she not obliterated from her catechisms the second commandment, and taught by the authority of the "Holy See" that the word that King James' translators rendered "repent" means "do penance?" Does she not teach that if the word of God and that of the Pope were in conflict, that of God must be set aside, and that of the Pope must stand? And does "Protestant" regard these as minor matters? We do not; few good Protestants do. We believe it entirely possible for men to possess the pure word of God, and yet "make it of none effect by their traditions." We have known Protestants who would just as willingly pray to the image of Budh as the image of Mary, and who would expect quite as much benefit from paying their devotions

at the shrine of Confucius as at the shrine of any saint in the Roman calendar. Again, we are asked, "Is it not exceedingly rare to meet with a native Catholic of mature years who is not well instructed in his catechism?" &c. And in the same connection "Protestant" honestly acknowledges that his own experience has not been large; which question and acknowledgement just about amount to saying, "I have very rarely met with a native Catholic of mature years; and I have very rarely met with such a one not well instructed in his catechism."

Again, we are told that the priest is oftener *perhaps* than we imagine looked up to as a "spiritual father." A very safe non-committal statement! It would have been equally true too, if instead of "oftener," he had said "less often;" or instead of "spiritual father," he had mentioned any specimen of Popish humanity from an Alexander VI. to a Xavier or a Fenelon. Such special pleading must gain converts, if at all, when first presented; for few will be carried away by it after the second thought.

Again we are told that "descendants of those who kept their faith in the day of persecution can everywhere be found." To what extent is this true? Does it mean in every province? or prefecture? or city? or district? or village? or within the range of "Protestant's" investigation? I am acquainted with a district of country about two hundred miles long, and from about five to forty miles broad. That district has been visited, village by village, by native colporteurs; and one village has been found in it of about a hundred families who are the descendants of Roman Catholics. It would be very interesting to all, and hurtful to none, if Protestant missionaries would let us know how the expression "everywhere be found" agrees with their experience. There is perhaps no single remark in the paper now under consideration where the theory is more flatly contradicted by experiment than the closing words of a passage in which the attempt is made to convince us that the instruction imparted by Romish priests is not superficial. It is said, "In a Catholic community, an educated priesthood cannot fail in the end to secure a well instructed people." They do fail however, almost uniformly, "Protestant" to the contrary notwithstanding. We have heard comparisons made on this very point between the intelligence of Spain and that of Scotland; of Italy and of England. And though Spain and Italy have been thoroughly under the power of the Romish priesthood, the comparisons were not such as to create an admiration for Popery. We however have not visited the continental countries, and are unwilling to theorize; but we refer "Protestant" to the south and west counties of Ireland, where Romish priests have had it all their own way for centuries. We do not believe that he will find a more ignorant and superstitious white English-speaking people beneath the sun than

that same "Catholic community." If he cannot go to Ireland, let him visit the Roman Catholic districts of almost any of our large western cities, and tell us afterwards of the "well instructed people" under the Popish priesthood. On this point we do not theorize, but "speak what we do know, and testify what we have seen." The result should not be expected to be different from what it is, when we remember that one of Rome's axioms is, "Ignorance is the mother of devotion." A company of Chinamen, or any other common men of the present day, must surely be very much edified and comforted by listening to a priest mumbling prayers in Latin, whether to the blessed Mary, or our exalted Saviour. The Romish priesthood secure a well instructed people! Really!

We were aware before reading "Protestant's" article that the Romish priests were often, though not by any means always, required to spend a long period in preparation before entering on their office; and though we would not despise the classics, yet we think it very doubtful whether even "Protestant" would regard it the wisest and best plan to require every pastor or missionary to have spent ten years in the study of the Latin language. A great many other things are necessary to make the man of God "thoroughly furnished," besides being able to read or recite prayers in monkish Latin.

Again we are told that "Romish missions have been planted on a better soil, far away in the interior." We know some Protestant missionaries who have a work about three hundred miles inland; and their experience is that the Chinese, officers and people, are just as hard hearted and deceitful there as in villages not five miles from some of the most busy commercial centres.

We have not time to mention all the thoughts suggested by "Protestant's" remarkable paper; and after having said that while we regard the six reasons that he gives for the success of Romish missions as worthy of serious consideration, we at the same time regard them as justly liable to very serious criticism, we dismiss the paper for the present, with calling attention to the fifth of those reasons. He says, "The line of demarcation is less wide between their (Popish) converts and the world around them." I confess that this is the first time I have ever seen it put forth in real earnest by a Protestant divine that it would be advisable to have the line of demarcation between God's professed people and the world less wide than it is at present; and I would be disposed to regard it as ironical, were it not that in the same connection Protestant converts are seemingly found fault with for often leaving their usual avocations after assuming their new name; and the fear is expressed that they are handled too delicately. How dare this or any other writer of meagre experience make such a sweeping charge, notwithstanding his confessed obligation to "speak modestly?" I do not profess to speak

for all the Protestant converts in China; but in sending you a very brief account of the annual meeting at Ningpo of the Presbytery with which I am connected, I have told you that we have about four hundred communicants. Of these four hundred, the great bulk continue in precisely the same callings as those in which they were before their baptism—i.e., if they were farmers, mechanics or tradesmen, or the mothers, wives or sisters of such then, they are *the same now*. I do hope that members of other Protestant missions in China will let us know through your paper to what extant the charge of “delicate handling” is well founded against Protestant converts.

As to their not being allowed to continue at their usual avocations after having assumed their new name, this is a practical and not always easily solved question. We have known it occasionally to occur, though not in our opinion too often. In a country like this, it may be presumed that some men before becoming Christians were engaged in idolatrous or other necessarily sinful callings, in which it would neither be desirable nor consistent to have them continue after having assumed their new name. Within the last few weeks, I have learned of a physician who before his baptism made a large part of his income by selling a patent medicine used by women for a secret but very nefarious purpose. Soon after his baptism, he came to his pastor to know whether it would be sinful for him to continue to sell the drug. He was told to abandon it immediately. Does “Protestant” think that he should have been advised to continue in this, his “usual avocation?” Does he think it would be wise for missionaries to countenance or wink at such practices in church members, even if they could thereby show a much greater number of professed Christians? This man, as many others, neither asked nor expected charity; but in case he had been poor and needed it, does “Protestant” think that alms would have been ill bestowed to enable him to subsist till he could find some honest and lawful employment? We do not.

Permit me to say in closing, that in preparing the above piece, I have “set down naught in malice.” There is no need for jealousy between any number of divisions of the Christian church in China, where there is plenty of room for all. My sole object has been to give reasons for believing that the “statistics” are beyond doubt “unreliable,” and to explain why the “lessons” have not inspired me with much greater admiration for Rome than I had before. This is surely a fair subject for discussion, especially as it has been introduced in a paper that is probably read by all Protestant missionaries in China. And though it is felt to be just about as much as a man’s reputation for candor and charity is worth to call in question on the coast of China any statement that is made in praise of Romanists, or present in a favorable light any charge that

may be made against Protestants and their work, yet it must be acknowledged that when shafts of criticism are leveled at the divisions of the Christian church, an evil is thereby pointed out which is at present irremediable. Every consistent Romanist religiously believes the statement of the Bishop of Shanghai, that the books and other efforts used by Protestants to propagate their faith are to be regarded as “false and impure (licentious);” and the statement of Archbishop Manning, when some Puseyite clergymen were endeavoring to bring about a reconciliation between the churches of Rome and England—when he said that such efforts were utterly useless, the thing sought was impossible, there could be no reconciliation with Rome only by the “submission” of the heretics. And every consistent Protestant believes that such assumptions are as useless and nonsensical as they are arrogant. Under such circumstances, neither party could, even if it were willing, long continue altogether silent as to the causes of separation.

PRESBYTER.

HANGCHOW, January, 1869.

ON THE BEST METHOD OF PRESENT- ING THE GOSPEL TO THE CHINESE.

BY REV. F. S. TURNER.

Nothing is more refreshing to the spirit of a solitary thinker than suddenly to discover unexpected sympathy in some distant quarter. For some years I have been endeavouring to ascertain the best way to recommend Christianity to the attention of the Chinese people. Surely there must be a *best* way of presenting the gospel to them; and if so, one would have supposed that all missionaries would be eagerly engaged in the search for it. I cannot say that I have seen this to be the case within my limited sphere of observation. Some persons have such overflowing faith in the gospel, that they appear to consider it unnecessary or unlawful to criticize the means of its promulgation. The young missionary is bidden to acquire the language as fast as he can, and then to preach in it with all his might. The what and the how of preaching are taken for granted. Either it is presumed that just such preaching as he was used to in his native country will do here; or else that he will pick up as he goes along all the hints he requires to

guide him in adapting his discourses to heathen audiences. But surely a little thought upon the immense difference between a nominally Christian congregation in England and a heathen crowd in a Chinese city will make the need of a special study of this question evident. The English audience, with rare exceptions, gives an unhesitating intellectual assent to the truth and importance of Christianity, and requires only a spiritual change in it. The heathen not only do not believe; they are not even intelligent doubters. To them the facts are strange, the doctrines mysterious, the very terms employed hardly intelligible; and besides all this, they are predisposed to treat the message with contemptuous neglect, and the messenger as an impudent intruder. In face of these vast differences between the audiences, if one were seriously to assert that no essential difference in the kinds of preaching is required, he would almost pronounce his own unsuitability to be a preacher of the gospel at all. Indeed, it seems passing strange that it is left to missionaries to initiate an inquiry into the manner in which they should prosecute their work. One would have imagined that the first step in missionary work would have been to assemble a council of the bishops and elders and wise men of the churches, to consider first of all, what message shall the heralds of the churches proclaim, and in what manner shall they set it forth, and to what arguments shall they trust to convince the heathen mind?—and that the choice and equipment of the particular missionaries would be only the secondary business. This has not been done. We are sent forth from the home garrisons with a general order to carry the war into the enemy's country, but without any particular instructions to guide us. We must therefore construct a plan of campaign for ourselves; and surely the study of this is not second in importance to the study of the language, which naturally occupies most of the young missionary's attention. What is the use of weapons if one does not know how to use them? With these views, I hasted with delight the following pass-

age in an earnest paper on "Preaching to the Chinese," contained in the January number of the RECORDER:—"My design however, in calling attention to the subject of preaching to the Chinese general public, is to elicit suggestions in answer to the questions—What is the best method to pursue? How can we so preach that they will believe? I wish those who have long experience in the work, who are acquainted with the reception various modes meet with, who understand what takes with and what repels a native mind, who know what truths to tell first, and what to reserve, who know, for instance, whether it is wise to preach the miracles of Christ in proof of his divinity before an unbelieving audience, would for the benefit of the large number of young missionaries in China give through your columns their views and advice on the subject." I rejoice to see that the writer of that paragraph appreciates so accurately the difficulty of our position, and has stated so exactly what we want to know. The various particular questions he asks, all of much interest and importance, are summed up in the one great question, "*How can we so preach that they will believe?*" Of course, "S. A." does not overlook that it is only the Divine Spirit which can make preaching effectual. He means, that he supposes there must be a manner of preaching which is in itself calculated to produce belief—such as will, with God's blessing, certainly produce belief; which, if it fails, does so, not from inherent defect, but from the obstinate opposition of the impenitent heart. In a word, what is that kind of preaching which will either convert the hearer, or leave him without excuse? Such is the question. I re-echo your correspondent's appeal for answers to it. In the meanwhile, I venture to contribute to the discussion of the question a few obvious suggestions, but which may perhaps be welcomed here and there; and hereafter I hope to be allowed to state my own difficulties more fully, to see if any response to them will be forthcoming.

It is remarkable that among the sacred books of a religion which claims

universal dominion, there should not be one which was primarily intended for the conversion of the heathen. Not only is there no whole book, but hardly even so much as a page, addressed in the first instance to pure heathen. In the inspired collection we have history and poetry and doctrine; philosophical speculation, prophetic vision, and theological discourse; arguments addressed to Jews, arguments addressed to Christians, arguments addressed to heretics; but almost an entire absence of anything whatever addressed immediately to heathen. It is therefore the more needful to study with close intentness such hints as we can find here and there as to apostolic practice, and such scanty examples as are recorded of apostolic preaching to the Gentiles. Among these, Paul's speech on Areopagus stands out unique—replete with instruction for all, but to the missionary of priceless value, as almost the only specimen of the kind which is extant. Alford says, "The commentators vie with each other in admiration of this truly wonderful speech of the great Apostle." And well they may; for surely among all the discourses recorded in Holy Writ, those only excepted of him "who spake as never man spake," this shines out unrivalled in its combination of exquisite tact and courtesy with the utmost plainness of speech, of loftiest sentiment with the soundest reasoning and most orderly sequence of ideas. Brief as it is, it is a perfect model for missionary preaching; and at the outset of our enquiry we cannot do better than study its excellences for our own imitation. Let me append a few notes on its manner and its matter.

1. Note the *manly respectfulness* of the Apostle's style of address. There is not a single fulsome compliment, though Athens furnished abundant excuse for many. Paul, methinks, cared little for, as he said nothing of, the glory and fame of Athenian art and literature and philosophy; but he seizes upon the most favourable aspect of their religious character as his starting point. He dwells upon what he can most approve among the objects of their worship. He culls arguments from their

poets. He addressed his hearers as sensible men—hardly so much to be blamed, by him at least, as to be pitied for their errors; and who may be expected to appreciate a sound argument, and do homage to higher truth when set before them. From him we learn that a sincere respect for and genuine courtesy towards our hearers is an essential prerequisite for a good missionary address. If Paul was careful to maintain this demeanour, how much more cause have we to do so. Christianity took its rise among a people but lightly esteemed in the world, excelling neither in arts nor in arms, obliged to yield the palm of martial prowess to Rome, of intellectual supremacy to Hellas. Proud as was the Jew of the special favour of Jehovah to his race, this distinction excited no jealousy among the unbelieving heathen, while in all other respects Judea held but a low rank among the nations. The gospel had then to work its way upwards from a conquered, despised, comparatively illiterate people, to nations wealthier, mightier, more refined, more learned. Now the process is reversed. The great nations which are now sending Christian missionaries to China possess a manifest superiority, which so far as it is acknowledged rather irritates than conciliates the Chinese. Their refusal to acknowledge it in other respects is too apt to irritate the missionary. In these circumstances, how easy it is to be guilty of the offensive vulgarity of boasting of our political greatness, flaunting our scientific achievements before the faces of the Chinese, and asseverating our superiority where it is not self-evident to them—for instance, in literature, in government, in public morality.

It should rather be our constant effort to prevent the Chinese from supposing that Christianity is English or American, and to screen divine revelation from an unjust implication in our national crimes and social immoralities. As a missionary, I could almost say, I abjure my earthly citizenship, and claim only to be regarded as a citizen of the kingdom of heaven. But if we go not thus far, at least let us attend to the simple rule of rhetoric and common sense, that if

we wish to persuade, we must be careful not to offend. The first step towards gaining a candid hearing for our message is to establish a friendly relation with the audience; and for this, a respectful demeanour and style of address is indispensable. But to speak respectfully, we must feel respectfully. We are preachers of the truth, not lawyers contending for a side. It becomes us therefore, first of all, to render a hearty adherence to Peter's maxim, "Honour all men"—even the Chinese.

2. The second characteristic I note in St. Paul's speech is the avoidance of an *antagonistic* manner. How gently he deals with these Athenians! Its language comes nearer to commendation, at least to excuse, than to blame. Mark those words, "Whom, though ye know him not, ye worship;" and again, "The times of this ignorance God overlooked." This contrasts with the denunciation and sarcasm which old Hebrew prophets poured out against idolatry. They vindicated known law. Paul proclaims a new gospel. At the close of the Tishbite's pleadings on Carmel, the blood of four hundred and fifty idolatrous priests rolled a crimson stream down Kishon. After Paul's discourse on Areopagus, Dionysius and others "clave unto him, and believed." Which manner of spirit then shall we be of?

An antagonistic manner is not necessarily discourteous, but certainly impolitic. Electricity accumulating round the positive pole induces an equal accumulation round the negative; so antagonism in the preacher will surely kindle a feeling of antagonism in the breasts of the hearers. We degrade ourselves from our true position if we become mere disputants. The temper of the debating society does not befit the pulpit. Let us teach, rather than argue. I do not mean dogmatise, but teach. Some folk seem to think that truth is made more impressive by a severe frown, a raised voice, and the clenched fist coming down with a thundering thump on the desk. But blustering positiveness often betrays an uneasy consciousness of the weakness of one's cause. He who has faith in the truth

can afford to be calm, and to wait. Paul stands on Mar's hill, but his soul is elevated to a loftier region, far above the spiritual level of the listening crowd. He speaks as one having authority, as conscious of inspiration. He knows the truth; and is not disturbed in his calm serenity by senseless opposition. He knows mankind, and can bear with their prejudices and misconceptions. Let us make him our model. The Chinese are a nation of conservatives, confirmed by four thousand years of superiority to all surrounding nations in their blind confidence that China is the very birth-place and fortress of moral truth. Shall we get angry at their pride, and embrace every opportunity to expose their ignorance, ridicule their superstitions, depreciate their sages, and decry their national greatness? Conservatism is an instinct of human nature, as prevalent in England and America as in China. The human mind naturally cleaves to what it knows, and has long known, of the good, the noble and the true; and is slow to think that anything better, nobler, truer, can exist—especially when the new appears at first acquaintance to contradict the old. Mencius said he had heard of the Chinese changing barbarians, but never of the barbarians changing Chinese. There was a measure of truth in this; and we cannot wonder if the Chinese would prefer it to continue true. Let us not contend with them, but deliver our message in a gentle, friendly spirit, and wait patiently for it to bear fruit.

3. I note that the Apostle chooses *common ground* to start from. He and the Athenians were of one mind as to the excellence of worship in itself. Further, the Athenians already had a vague feeling of distrust in the sufficiency of their numerous temples and shoals of divinities, as was manifested in their erecting the altar to the unknown God. This is Paul's starting point, from which he would lead them gradually to a recognition of the revealed Deity. But he has not got far on his road before he discovers and gladly draws attention to some Grecian poets who had made some progress in the right direction long before. Men cannot be driv-

en into the church; they must be led. And to lead them, it is necessary first to go up to them, to get to where they are, to take hold of their very hands, and so gently draw them along. We cannot make a man a Christian by logically knocking him down, and stripping him of all his preconceived notions, and then forcibly arraying his naked soul in the robes of biblical doctrines. We must open the door of his soul, and let in the light; and then he will of himself discern his true state. To open the door, we must find a key; and only sympathy can do this. I have however extended my somewhat trite observations to a good length, and will now leave commenting upon the manner of Paul's memorable discourse. On the matter of it, I beg permission to send you a few remarks for a future number.

HONGKONG, February, 1869.

HISTORY OF THE SOUTHERN SUNG DYNASTY.

A TRANSLATION.

(Continued.)

In the 9th month (11th year of Kao-tsung), Wu-ling 吳璘 recaptured from the Mongols the district of Dzin-tseo 秦州, Yang-tsin 楊政 recovered the district of Long-tzeo 龍州, and Koh-ao 郭浩 retook the districts of Wa-tseo 華州 and Son-tseo 咸州. In the midst of these successes, the Emperor ordered these divisions of the imperial army to be recalled; in obedience to which order all returned to Tsen (Chin-kiang).

Previous to the recovery of Dzin-tseo, Wu-lin heard that Wu-tsang 胡蘆 and Dzih-peh-tsoh 習不祝 with an army of fifty thousand men, were encamped at Liu-kyia-kyion 劉家圈. He inquired of Wu-s-tsiang 胡世將 whether he thought it practicable to make a successful attack

on the Mongols in their present position, or not. S-tsong asked Wu-lin as to his plan. Wu-lin replied, "I would arrange the troops according to an order lately prescribed, which has in view the accumulation of force. While the order of battle is forming, I would protect the front and flanks by a file of the useless horses in camp, chained together so as to form a complete wall. Should one of the horses be wounded, a fresh one to be brought up, and he released. When the arrangements for battle are completed, the files of horses to be moved rapidly around to the rear. The first line to be composed of spearmen on war-carts. The second to be armed with heavy bows, also on war-carts. The third with bows of still greater power. The fourth with bows of the very strongest force. Each line on war-carts." When the enemy were within one hundred paces, the fourth line were to draw their heavy bows. When within seventy-two paces, all armed with bows were to shower forth their arrowy messengers in concert; the spearmen the meanwhile sitting (in their carts) in front, in defensive posture. The second general line was arranged the same way, and armed with like weapons. When the files of horses front and flank were removed, the advance was to be made in this order. The generals under Wu said, "If we go into action, our soldiers must inevitably perish." Wu-lin replied, "The order of battle is taken from the ancient tactics of Soh-wu-lin 束伍令, and those of you who secretly throw discredit on this plan of battle do so because of ignorance. What is over and above that which is really needful in the merits of the plan of fighting by means of war-carts is better than the best of other plans of fighting." Having heard him through, their confidence was established; and each one went about arranging his part of the order of battle. The enemy, though brave, were not able to withstand the attack. Wu-tsang was himself present on the field of battle, and took part in the action, exerting himself to the utmost with the whole force

at his command. Wu-lin, on the other hand, brought up his two grand divisions successively, one fighting while the other rested. Wu himself, dressed in splendid robes, sat on his fat horse, and riding from line to line, with the waving of his flag urged on his soldiers to victory. The soldiers, everywhere inspired with confidence by his calm, determined spirit, vied with each other in deeds of desperate bravery; so that the Mongols were beaten at every point. Wu-tsan himself escaped to the city of Lah-kyia 腊家, and put it in a state of defense. Wu-lin immediately laid siege to the city; but about the time that his arrangements for taking the city were completed, the messenger from the capital brought the command of the Emperor to cease fighting, and lead back the army—that a treaty of peace was about to be concluded with the enemy.

Dzing-kwe at this time forged an order from the Emperor, and sealed it with his seal of office; and had Iah-fi placed in confinement. He wished to put him to death, and for this purpose took secret counsel with Tsang-tsin. It was determined to offer a large bribe to his personal attendants, if they would give information as to any punishable crime committed by Iah-fi. But none of his attendants could be bribed to do the base, false deed.

Hearing that one of his under officers, named Wang-tsin 玉俊, was given to bring accusations against others, to such an extent that he was usually called the bird of prey; and that on account of this mean propensity his promotion had been prevented, through the interference of Tsang-hyien 張憲 (the son-in-law of Iah-fi), Dzing-kwe and Tsang-tsing sent therefore to ask Wang-tsin if he would bring formal accusations against Iah-fi. He promised to do so. But Dzing-kwe and Tsang-tsin, after consultation, determined that as Tsang-hyien and Wang-tsin were both Generals in the corps of Iah-fi, it would be better to get up a quarrel between these two which would lead to a criminal act, in which Iah-fi would

be involved; and in this way prevent all suspicion of foul play, when the matter should be brought to the notice of the Emperor. With this object in view, Tsang-tsin himself prepared for Wang-tsin accusations against Tsang-hyien, falsely charging him with an attempt to take forcible possession of Siang-yang 襄陽 (in the province of Hu-peh 湖北); that for this purpose he was endeavoring to get the support of the division of the army lately commanded by his father-in-law Iah-fi. On account of this false accusation, Tsang-hyien was taken into custody, and imprisoned at Ching-kyiang. Dzing-kwe ordered a criminal judge to make an official investigation of the matter, and if possible to induce Tsang-hyien himself to acknowledge that he had received a letter from Iah-yuin 岳雲 (son of Iah-fi), requesting him to make every effort to get the support of the army lately commanded by his father. The judge ordered Tsang-hyien to be beaten, in order to make him confess. The beating was continued until there was not a sound piece of skin on his body, but it did not elicit the least confession of guilt. Finding this of no avail, Tsang-tsin forged a confession as coming from Tsang-hyien, and forwarded it to Dzing-kwe; whereupon Dzing-kwe forged an order as coming from the Emperor, to have Iah-fi and his son Iah-yuin taken into custody for the purpose of bearing testimony in the matter. Iah-fi said respectfully, "the God who is the ruler of heaven can bear me witness in this matter, that I am innocent."

Iah-fi and his son were put in close confinement. Dzing-kwe ordered Ho-cu and Tseo-san-we 周三畏 to examine into this matter officially. Ho-cu 何鑄 called Iah-fi into the judgment hall, and asked him what was the nature of his revolt. Iah-fi tore his clothes open, and showed him four characters written on his breast with indelible ink. Dzing cong pao kok 盡忠報國—"Diligently and faithfully repay the obligations due to government."

Ho-cü, having examined the matter carefully, found that there was no evidence against Iah-fi; and knowing that enmity was at the bottom of the accusation, he plainly reported the case thus to Dzing-kwe. Dzing-kwe urged that it was the will of the Emperor that Iah-fi should be condemned.

(*To be continued.*)

CORRESPONDENCE.

SHALL OUR TEACHERS KEEP THE SABBATH?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHINESE RECORDER:—

Ought missionaries to require their heathen teachers to observe the Sabbath?

The objection commonly urged against a requisition of this kind is, that "it is not wise to force our heathen teachers to act the part of hypocrites in obeying our requirement;" thus making it a matter of expediency whether we ought to insist upon their observing the Sabbath or not. But I view the case as quite otherwise, regarding the fourth commandment as making it imperative on us to require all of our employees, who are hired by the month, and whose time we pay for including the Sabbath as well as other days, to observe the Sabbath. "In it thou shall not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates." This form of expression is manifestly designed to include all persons who are connected with our families, or in our employ, or who may be brought under our influence, even including "the stranger," who may be temporarily stopping with us.

Our teachers we must regard as hired servants, in the Hebrew sense of that term. Among the Hebrews, hired servants, next to the children, were the most honored of all of the subordinate members of the household. It was to one of this class of men that Abraham entrusted the care and oversight of all of his property, and sent

him on the important business of getting a wife for his son Isaac.

Our private teachers, whether heathen or Christian, occupy the most honored position of any in our employ. And yet who will assert that they are not simply hired servants in the sense above defined? We call them, and they are at perfect liberty to accept or to reject the terms proposed. But when they thus voluntarily enter our service, whether it be for a day, a week, a month, or a year, they are our hired servants for the time specified in the agreement. Every intelligent teacher must regard himself as holding this relation to his employer; and consequently when any difficulty arises from without, requiring official interposition, he claims protection, and we render assistance, on the ground that he belongs to us as a hired servant. But let this relation cease, and the teacher be dismissed from our employ, he then will have no special claim upon us for protection or support more than any other individual of the community.

Hence while our teachers hold this relation of hired servants to us, it becomes simply a question of duty which we owe to our God, whether we will require them to observe his Sabbaths or not.

The requiring of them to do this is often, I fear, made to appear more difficult and irksome than it really is in fact. "I do not wish," says one, "to be constantly catechising my teacher about keeping the Sabbath, threatening to dismiss him if he does not, &c. &c. And then to question him every Monday morning whether he was at public service on the Sabbath or not, and the like—it is belittling, it is treating my teacher too much like a schoolboy, and not like a teacher;—he knows my wishes, and how I view the Sabbath, and if he does not observe it, it is his own sin, and not mine."

Such a course, I conceive, is not necessary. Take the following as illustrations. A servant of mine, when I was absent, spent the Sabbath in attending to his own secular business. Some friends advised to cut his wages, and thereby teach him not to break

the Sabbath. But instead of that, I explained to him the fourth commandment, and told him that God had made it my duty to require him, and all who belonged to me as employes, to observe the Sabbath. Now if he could not keep the Sabbath, I could not retain him in my employ; for I feared God, and must obey him. He said he had never understood it so before, and promised to comply with this requisition hereafter. I have never had occasion to speak to him again on this subject. A few days after, I requested my heathen teacher to explain to me the fourth commandment, and state particularly whether that recognized him as a member of my family or not. He at once stated that it did. He said that I paid him for his time, that he "ate my rice," and was "under my direction." I then told him the course I had taken with the servant, and stated I must take the same ground in regard to him; if he continued in my employ, he must observe the Sabbath. That ten or fifteen minutes' talk with my teacher settled the matter with him. He has uniformly ever since attended public service on the Sabbath, except when he could excuse himself on account of sickness, either of himself or of his family.

If there is danger of making our heathen teachers hypocrites by requiring them to observe the Sabbath, is there not equal danger of making the heathen children in our schools, and other heathen in our employ, hypocrites in the same way? And if such is the fact, why should not the latter be excused from such an obligation, as well as the former? And therefore do we not lose much influence over our heathen teachers, and through them over others of the heathen, by allowing them to do as they choose about observing the Sabbath?

If our heathen teachers openly and flagrantly transgress any of the commands of the second table of the Law, we at once dismiss them. Ought we not to manifest the same zeal in requiring them to observe the first table of the Law, so far as we may be able,

that we do in requiring them to observe the second? And if we neglect to do this, are we not practically telling the heathen that we regard the requisitions of the former as being less imperative than those of the latter? And consequently, are we not liable to some such reproofs as Ezekiel administered to the priests of his time, "Her priests have violated my law, and have profaned my holy things; they have put no difference between the holy and profane, neither have they showed difference between the unclean and the clean, and have hid their eyes from my Sabbaths, and I am profaned among them."? Ezek. 22: 26. In old times the adversaries of Zion "did mock at her Sabbaths." So they do now. And how much more occasion will they have to do so, if missionaries neglect their duty on this subject?

L. B. PEET.

FOOCHOW, Feb. 12, 1869.

COMPRESSION OF WOMEN'S FEET.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHINESE RECORDER:—

It will readily be conceded that feet are most important members of the human system, and that they are admirably adapted to the purposes for which they were designed. Doubtless the Chinese of the present day entertain the same opinion; but a custom, originated ages since, still holds its sway, and China's wives and daughters groan under the inhuman practice of compressing the feet.

I confess to a feeling quite akin to indignation, as I think of children undergoing the writhing torture that must necessarily be inflicted at the commencement of the process, and then in later life tottering about on their miserable club feet, assisted by a staff, or supported by a servant.

Cannot something be done? It may be said, "Why such haste? The good time will come, and this cruel practice will be done away with." But why wait? Why not begin now? Why not require boarding scholars and church members to unbind their feet? Actual experiment in a few instances proves the thing not wholly impracticable. In a boarding school known to the writer, four girls have unbound their feet. It is true three of these were quite young; but one was eighteen years of age, and her feet had been bandaged ten years. Much firmness is sometimes needed; and in the case of the girl just referred to, she was told that she must conform to the requirement or leave the school. She yielded,

and now from day to day walks about on feet similar to what nature gave her. If then the plan is feasible in regard to pupils in our boarding schools, might not the same be true, in most instances, in reference to church members? Should they not be required to unbind their feet, and should not Christian parents be positively forbidden to allow foot-compression in their families? Perhaps it will be said, "This is altogether too radical." Is it ever too radical to do right? Some will advocate more careful instruction of the people in regard to duty on this point; but are not more vigorous measures necessary? Ought not something to be *done*, as well as *said*, after more than sixty years of missionary labor in China?

Of course it is respectable and refined to have small feet—in Foochow the smaller the more genteel; and it is equally true that large feet, except in the case of certain classes, may subject one to the suspicion of low rank, or even of abandoned character. But this in no wise militates against the idea of reform. Let large feet be *made* respectable among Christians, and let them understand that no amount of reasoning will ever be able to make wrong right, be it ever so specious, or quieting to one's conscience.

It may be urged, and truly, that western ladies sometimes practice a more injurious form of compression. This is nothing to the purpose. It will never make this less an evil that the other is so much the greater. The custom of compressing the feet is "only evil continually," and while western ladies make a voluntary offering at the shrine of Fashion, this is commenced amid the groans and tears of the child-martyrs. Says a church member, a widow of thirty, connected with the school mentioned above, "In my case the process of bandaging commenced when I was nine years old; my feet were then long, and were forced into small shoes; I cried very much on account of the extreme pain, and then my mother would beat my feet with the back of a cleaver, and so much was I injured by this punishment that I was obliged to sit many days before I could walk. My feet were compressed to a three inch size, but now they are five inches long, as I have loosened the bandages. When I went home in the sixth month, my mother scolded me a great deal because I had allowed my feet to grow so large; I told her I intended to unbind them altogether, and she replied that then I must not come home at all, as I would disgrace her."

This instance will illustrate not only the suffering caused by this barbarous custom, but also the difficulties lying in the path of duty. Doubtless female church members will feel it to be a cross—this unbinding of the feet. A good plan will be to take the cross up, and carry it. Let the churches take the initiative in the work of reform, and let not the heathen be able to point to Christians, should we remonstrate with them on the wrong and cruelty of the practice, and say, "First cast out the beam out of your own eye."

The writer cannot close without remarking that it would be exceedingly gratifying to hear expressions of opinion on this subject from other parts of the Empire.

F.

FOOCHOW, Feb., 1869.

CHRISTIANITY VERSUS POLYGAMY.

MY DEAR MR. EDITOR:—

Allow me to ask Mr. Nelson a question: "By what authority shall any man undertake to *make a law* for the church of Christ, which is not already made in the New Testament; which is not hinted at there; for the existence of which in the primitive church we have no shadow of proof?"

This question involves a general principle, and our answer to it will affect much besides our treatment of polygamy. But to confine ourselves to one point: where is the Scripture authority for the law "that no Chinese Christian shall be admitted into the church who has more wives than one?" Here is a Chinese who believes in Jesus, against whose baptism no objection can be alleged, save that he does not see it to be his duty to divorce his second wife. Whence does Mr. Nelson derive his authority to debar that man from church fellowship? Has the head of the church given Mr. N. such authority? It is a grave question. To stand between Christ and one's brother, and refuse that brother any part or lot in the visible communion of saints, is a responsibility one may not lightly assume. I cannot see that the apostles established such a rule. The silence of Scripture appears decisive that they did not. A rule so novel, so difficult of application, so contrary to the preconceived notions of right of both Jew and Gentile, must surely have occasioned remark in some quarter, to necessitate apostolic injunction or argument in its favour.

I wish Mr. N., instead of advocating the establishment of monogamy by ecclesiastical law, would write a book to *convince the Chinese* of its obligation. I have had to deal with the difficulty, and I know they require instruction

about it. Intelligent and excellent Chinese Christians, not implicated in polygamy either directly or indirectly, have summed up the case to me thus: "The Old Testament permits polygamy; the New Testament does not mention it." Let Mr. N. reply to this in a Chinese pamphlet. If he can convince *them*, he will do good service, and the whole church will be indebted to him. I have thought of making an attempt myself, but as yet have found no leisure.

F. S. TURNER.

HONGKONG, 17th February, 1869.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHINESE RECORDER:—

I should be happy to pass over in silence the late discussion on divorce and re-marriage, had the subject been dropped altogether. But Mr. Nelson having now presented it in another shape, I shall be happy if he will answer the following questions:—

1. Did the patriarchs live in open adultery?

2. Will he quote one passage from the Sacred Scripture where God has approved of sinful practices, such as lying, fornication, murder, &c.?

3. Will he give one *single* instance, where God has regulated sins—i. e., given laws for their practice?

Whilst I myself believe monogamy to be the only form of wedlock conducive to family happiness and morality, I do not, and with the authority of the Sacred Scriptures on my side, look upon polygamy as I do upon sins strictly prohibited by the word of God.

1. Polygamy has been ratified by God by confirming the blessings of all of Jacob's children, whether they were from the first or second wives, or from the maid-servants.

We find on the contrary (Deut. 23:2) illegitimate children excluded from the blessings of public worship and from public offices in the church.

2. In the case of David, God says: "I have *given* (not merely allowed) thee thy master's wives into thy bosom," &c. Hence polygamy was not only tolerated, but openly acknowledged by

God, and laws were given to regulate the same.

The passages in Matthew and Mark have nothing whatever to do with polygamy. The Lord only condemns the loose way in which the Jews sent away their wives. And if Mr. Nelson will only look into the New Testament, whose authority alone he acknowledges, he will find that "*hardness of heart*" refers to *divorce*, and not to *polygamy*; and that our Lord teaches them to live with their wedded wives, and not send them away, as Mr. Nelson wishes them to do, when becoming Christians.

The expression "male and female" being in the adjective form does not admit of the numeral "*one*," nor of the indefinite article; and the translators of the English Bible have wisely omitted so ungrammatical a rendering as that suggested by Mr. N. The passage merely says, God made man "male and female"—i. e., beings dependent on each other, and who should not be separated, unless for adultery. How Mr. N. can make this passage to meet his arguments on polygamy, is not so evident. The second argument which Mr. N. quotes against polygamy is from 1. Cor. 7:2. If he will call to his mind the social state of Greece at the time when Paul wrote the epistle, he will find that concubinage was prevalent to an alarming degree. In opposition to this illegal way of living, and to "avoid fornication" (not polygamy), Paul commands them to marry; or, in other words, to enter into lawful wedlock.

If Paul had been reasoning against polygamy, he certainly would have used the numeral "*one*," as he did in 1. Tim. 3. Mr. N. is not arguing from the word of God, but simply forcing his sense upon the passages he quotes. Let him first prove that polygamy is adultery, and that it has been so declared by God, before jumping at conclusions not warranted by the Sacred Scriptures. He must first prove that polygamy did not exist when Paul made it imperative on a bishop to have only "*one*" wife, and that "drunkenness, striking, brawling, covetousness, and adultery" are *not* sins, and have

not been declared to be such in the Old and New Testaments. Neither Dr. Livingston nor any other person has power to define what constitutes sin differently from the word of God. All Mr. N.'s other illustrations taken at random from heathen practices are more than useless, for they are not and never have been sanctioned by the law of God, and have never been practiced with approbation by the holy men of the old dispensation.

The only question to be settled is, whether or not a transition state is acknowledged in the Sacred Scriptures. This has been answered in the affirmative by the delegates of most of the German Missionary Societies. The three things to be decided were—(1) polygamy; (2) domestic slavery; and (3) certain rites, such as Paul himself practiced after his conversion, and after he had preached the gospel for many years. There was no need of telling the Roman and Germanic nations that a bishop should be the husband of "one wife" only; for polygamy has never been acknowledged by them. But it was different with the Jews and among the Greeks.

Nobody would be more opposed to involuntary slavery than Paul; and yet he sent Onesimus back to Philemon, and does not even hint at the necessity of liberating the absconded and now converted slave.

And finally, Paul, who would not allow Jewish practices for the sake of salvation, allowed himself to be shaved, and openly performed certain rites which he knew to be obsolete and of no power after the death of Christ.

Such practices, therefore, as are *not* declared sin by the law of God, may remain untouched until the generation has passed away. If any person takes another view of the subject, let him set himself right with his conscience, but abstain from quoting passages of the Sacred Scriptures which have nothing whatever to do with the subject under discussion.

By inserting this you will oblige

Yours faithfully,

W. LOBSCHEID.

VICTORIA, 26th February, 1869.

DEAR MR. EDITOR:—

In the CHINESE RECORDER of January, 1869, some German missionaries in China are mentioned as opposed to the view taken in the article at the head of that paper. Now as the words "opposed to the view taken here" (meaning the article of the Rev. R. Nelson) might convey to the reader the idea that those German missionaries are favorable to the unrestricted continuation of polygamy within a Christian community consisting of former heathens, I ask you to insert in the CHINESE RECORDER the accompanying translation of a few paragraphs taken from our printed rules for the evangelical congregation of the Basel Mission, in order that it may be known what we at least hold with regard to polygamy in the mission field.

With regard to the marriage of polygamists, who desire to join the church and become members of our congregations, or who have already taken this step, our church members observe the following principles:—

a. Polygamy is repugnant to the express and clear command of our blessed Lord and Saviour, and for this reason cannot be tolerated in a Christian congregation, but must be abolished as far as this can be done without acts of violence to conscience.

b. On the other hand, polygamistic marriages, which have been contracted by people in their heathenish state, are not to be considered equal to adulterous unions of Christian persons; and, as the word of God teaches the indissolubility of marriage as plainly and distinctly as monogamy, cannot be dissolved summarily without regarding the circumstances of the case.

c. Therefore it is laid down as a rule in our congregations, that polygamistic marriages of newly converted persons be either dissolved or the persons separated, if it can be done without committing acts of violence to conscience; whilst they must be suffered as an unalterable evil of this state of transition (i.e., from heathenism to Christianity), whenever the dissolution of a polygamistic covenant would but produce still greater evils, and be followed by fresh sins.

93. Amongst a people living in polygamy, the following persons are to be con-

sidered as separable, and such as can be forsaken by their consorts without violence to conscience.

a. Husbands and wives whose marriage according to the word of God would be inadmissible, regardless of the prohibition against polygamy (such as persons too nearly related by blood).

b. Women, who have had unlawful intercourse with other men, if they have no children by their husband, whether their marriage according to heathen notions was lawful or unlawful.

c. All concubines who have not been publicly and formally married, if they have no children by their husband.

d. Husbands may be forsaken, if the wife, who has become a Christian, has not been publicly and formally married, but only maintained as a concubine.

e. Husbands who, when their lawful married wives have become Christians, do in fact no more acknowledge them as such, and yet from hatred, refuse to give them the customary formal dismissal, or bill of divorce.

f. Husbands who do not confine themselves to their lawful wives and their concubines, but also keep up unlawful intercourse with others.

94. The following are to be considered as polygamistic consorts, who cannot be sent away or forsaken without violence to conscience.

a. All wives who have sacrificed their innocence for the man, and have had no intercourse with any other man except their husband, or at least have never committed adultery; unless they obstinately remain in heathenism, and make Christian life in a family absolutely impossible.

b. All wives who have brought forth children to their husband and lead an irreproachable life, especially after they have become Christians.

c. Husbands who have not had any intercourse with other than their married consorts, and who treat their wives as wives, even when they have become Christians, and please them as such.

95. All women divorced from their husbands, whether they be lawful wives or merely concubines, must after their divorce, if they remain heathens, be compensated by the Christian husband accord-

ing to the law of their respective countries; and if they have become Christians, as long as they do not enter upon a new marriage, they are to be supported as far as necessary. They are also under no restrictions as to contracting a lawful marriage in the Christian community.

96. Should, however, members of a congregation, who had as Christians lived in a state of polygamy, as allowed by 94, now become uneasy in their conscience, and after mutual agreement ask for a separation, the presbytery may then proclaim it. In such an instance, the woman must entirely withdraw, and determine to remain henceforth unmarried, but the husband is bound to provide a maintenance for her.

97. After a man has accepted Christianity, and is a member of the church, he cannot marry a second wife as long as the first is living. Any infringement of this rule is adultery, and must be treated as such.

I may add that according to our rules regarding the offices in the Christian community, no polygamist can hold office in the congregations of the Basel Mission in Africa, India, or China.

Very truly yours,
JACOB LOERCHER,
Basel Missionary.

HONGKONG, 28th Feb., 1869.

THE "ORDER IN COUNCIL."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHINESE RECORDER:—

In the admirable answer to the anti-missionary articles of the *Times*, there is curious mistake. It is said that, under the "China and Japan Order in Council," any one guilty of "publicly deriding any religion observed in China" is liable to certain heavy penalties. But the order in question only forbids deriding, insulting, &c., of such a nature as "to provoke a breach of the public peace."

I remain,
Yours very truly,
CARSTAIRS DOUGLAS.

AMOY, 24th Feb., 1869.

[We do not quite agree with our correspondent's construction of the order. The 100th Section, from which we quoted, enumerates three things for which a British subject may be fined and imprisoned—1st, for "publicly deriding, mocking, or insulting any religion established or observed in China or in Japan;" 2nd, for "publicly offering any insult to any religious service, feast, or ceremony established or kept in any part of China or in Japan, or to any place of worship, tomb, or sanctuary belonging to any such religion, or to the ministers or professors thereof;" 3rd, for "wilfully committing any act tending to bring any such religion or its ceremonies, mode of worship, or observances into hatred, ridicule, or contempt, and thereby to provoke a breach of the public peace." This last conditional clause seems to be connected only with the third class of offences enumerated; and we infer that if a British subject should publicly offer an insult to a Chinese tomb, even if the act provoked no breach of the peace, and could not be shown to tend to such a result, he would become liable to the penalties imposed. The same would be true of any subject "guilty of publicly deriding, mocking, or insulting any religion established or observed in China." We prefer, however, our correspondent's view; and if the Courts indorse his construction of the order, we shall be glad to find that ours is wrong.—ED.]

PROTESTANT MISSIONS IN KWANGTUNG.

ED. RECORDER:—

I enclose herewith a tabular statement of the various missions in this province, except those at Swatow, for the year 1868. It is not as complete as I would wish; but it is a near approximation to accuracy, as far as it goes. It is to be stated that one of those included in the list of missionaries is wholly occupied as an English pastor, and another has part of his time taken up as a German pastor. There are three or four missionaries absent, who have been longest in the field. One is about to leave, not to return. Seven of those in the list have not been here long enough to have sufficient knowledge to engage in full missionary work. This would give 22 as the number of active laborers.

Some of the native assistants are young men who have not that experi-

ence and established character necessary for extensive usefulness among their countrymen. In this column are included not only preachers, but colporteurs whose time is occupied in evangelistic work.

The column of communicants is an approximation. It is difficult to say, in most missions, how many of those admitted as members are in good and regular standing. Much allowance is doubtless to be made for persons who have been brought up in heathenism, and who after a profession of Christianity are surrounded by all the blighting influences of idolatry. There is also a difference in the practice of different missions in the admission of members; so that if the column of communicants is to be understood as only including those who are true converts, more or less allowance is to be made.

Under the head of printing, full returns have not been made. At the London Mission Press in Hongkong, the following were printed during the year; but this press supplies other missions and stations at the North.

300 Parts of the Old Testament.
20,000 New Testaments.
30,000 Four Gospels and Acts.
5,000 Proverbs and Ecclesiastes.
9,700 Commentaries.
2,000 Pilgrim's Progress.
37,000 Tracts.

The Presbyterian Mission is mostly supplied with books and tracts from the press in Shanghai.

The Southern Baptist Mission printed 15,838 tracts, and 2,161 portions of the Bible.

The statistics here presented will give your readers some idea of the present state of the work in this province. I would be glad to see a similar statement once a year from every province in which Protestant missionaries are laboring, and I hope you will have contributors who will attend to the matter, so that we may have a yearly record made of the steps taken in advance in the great work of evangelizing China.

Yours, &c.,
J. G. KERR.

CANTON, Jan. 27th, 1869.

[March,

THE CHINESE RECORDER

238

MISSIONS.	Foreign Missionaries.				REMARKS.
	Native Assistants.		Chapels.		
	Boys.	Girls.	Communicants.	Catechumens.	Contributions.
London Missionary Society.	4	12	7	11	\$60
English Wesleyan Society.	7	5	8	6	Dispensary at one station. Printing press in Hongkong.
American Presbyterian Mission.	8	6	1	5	..
United Presbyterian Mission.	2	...	1	1	..
Southern Baptist Convention.	1	9	3	3	..
Berlin Missionary Society.	2	7	4	2	..
Basel Missionary Society.	5	12	4	1700	..
Rhenish Missionary Society.	4	10	6	97	..
Church Missionary Society.	1	1	1	1	..
Berlin Ladies' Society. For Foundlings.	1	1	1
Independent.	1	1	1
Total	31	64	32	35	2407 228 1061 ..

40 foundlings, besides the girls, in school. 8 young ladies connected with the institution.

STATISTICS OF MISSIONS IN KWANGTUNG.

The Chinese Recorder
AND
MISSIONARY JOURNAL.

Rev. S. L. Baldwin, Editor.

FOOCHOW, MARCH, 1869.

BIRTHS.

At Tungchow, Feb. 17th, 1869, a son (CHARLES GAYLEY) to Rev. C. R. MILLS, of the American Presbyterian Mission.

At Canton, March 4th, 1869, a daughter to J. G. KERR, M. D., of the American Presbyterian Mission.

DEATH.

At Pennington, New Jersey, U. S. A., December 16th, 1868, CHARLES SPERRY MACLAY, third son of Rev. R. S. Maclay, D. D., and Henrietta C., his wife, of the American M. E. Mission, Foochow, aged 13 years, 5 months, and 7 days.

The RECORDER for February was sent
To all ports south of Foochow, per Stmr.
Yesso, March 3rd.

To all ports north of Foochow, per Stmr.
Prince Kung, March 6th.

To America, with the January number,
per P. M. Steamer of March 20th.

To England, with the January number,
per Mail of March 23rd, from Hongkong.

EDITORIAL ITEMS.

—We intended to give in this number editorial notices of the Report of the Wesleyan Mission Hospital at Hankow, the Report of the Berlin Foundling Institution at Hongkong, and the Report of the Chinese Vernacular Schools under the superintendence of the Rev. A. Hanspach; but finding our columns already full, we reluctantly postpone these matters to our next number.

—We propose soon to send blanks to all the mission stations, asking for statistics similar to those given by Dr. Kerr in this number. We hope to publish in our July number a complete table of the Statistics of Protestant Missions in China. Will our friends please bear it in mind, and be ready to fill up the blanks as soon as they receive them?

—We are indebted to Rev. M. J. Knowlton for his paper on the Mountain Tribes of Chekiang province, which will appear in whole or in part in our next. Rev. H. V. Noyes and Rev. C. H. Butcher will also please accept thanks for their favors, which we hope to use soon.

MISSIONARY INTELLIGENCE.

PEKING.—Mrs. C. V. R. Bonney, long and favorably known at Canton, returned to China by the last P. M. Steamer, bringing with her Miss Douw and Miss Adams, of Albany, New York. They are to labor under the direction of the American Woman's Union Missionary Society, and will establish an institution at Peking for the instruction of Chinese girls, to be known as the "American Mission Home." They will also engage in evangelical labor among the women at the capital. We wish them great success in their excellent work, and have no doubt that they will receive a hearty welcome from all the missionary body at Peking. The Society by which they are sent out is supported by members of all the evangelical churches.

TUNGCHOW.—Rev. C. R. Mills and family, of the American Presbyterian Mission, are to go by steamer to Liverpool, about the 1st of April, en route to the United States.

SHANGHAI.—We are indebted to Rev. L. N. Wheeler for the following items:—Rev. J. M. W. Farnham, of the American Presbyterian Mission, is much encouraged by the results of his labors in connection with mission boarding schools.—Rev. Robert White and Mrs. White recently arrived in this city from Dublin. They come as missionaries to the Chinese, unconnected with any Society, and propose to join Mr. Taylor's party at Yangchow, as preliminary to the final selection of a particular field of labor.—Rev. Y. J. Allen is successfully conducting the government school here; and what with the church paper, a secular Chinese newspaper issued every other day under his editorial supervision, preaching, &c., finds his time well occupied.—Dr. Macgowan, at the instance of the Tautai, is engaged in translating and compiling works on metallurgy, mining and geology. He is doing important missionary work in giving gratuitous medical attendance at the hospital, where Rev. E. H. Thomson, of the American Protestant Episcopal Mission, daily preaches to the people.—At a meeting of missionaries and others, held on the evening of the 12th February, at the residence of Rev. Mr. Allen, an interesting discussion was had on the question, to what extent should the missionary expect Consular protection and assistance in carrying forward his work in China? The opinion was accepted with great unanimity that foreign protection should be appealed to in as few cases as possible. Dr. F. Porter Smith, of Hankow, stated that he had found in his experience the most satisfactory way of meeting difficulties with the people was to represent every case directly to native officials.

Consul General G. F. Seward, by special re-